



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,868	01/29/2001	Hannu Aronsson	290.745USN	8733
21050	7590	03/30/2004	EXAMINER	
ROLF FASTH, FASTH LAW OFFICES 629 E. BOCA RATON ROAD PHOENIX, AZ 85022			ZHONG, CHAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/744,868	ARONSSON, HANNU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chad Zhong	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 24-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 24-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 24-40 are presented for examination.
2. The drawings are not enclosed within the Application. Applicant is respectfully requested to submit drawings.
3. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
pg 11, line 19, “realised” should be changed to “realized”.
5. The specification is objected to because of the following:  
current US patent policy does not permit the use of hyperlinks in the specification. Such links are directed to an Internet site, the contents of which are subject to change without notice. Therefore, the potential for inclusion of new matter would be a constant problem. See page 17, for example. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph***

6. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
  - i. the receiver – claim 24.

Art Unit: 2154

- b. The claim language in the following claims is murky or not clearly understood:
- i. As per claim 24, line 18, it is not clearly understood whether "a receiver" refers to "the receiver" in claim 24, line 17 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used);

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al. (hereinafter Gardner), EP 0890913 in view of Saito et al. (hereinafter Saito) EP 0923034.

9. As per claim 24, Gardner teaches the system substantially as claimed wherein an information delivery system that is connected to communication networks, comprising:

an information delivery server comprising:

(b) the information processing unit being adapted to process the messages based on key data contained in the messages, fetch information requested in the messages, handle the fetched information and develop replies to the messages (pg 8, lines 47-49, lines 13-15);

(c) information sending modules in communication with the information processing unit for converting the replies to a form suited for the receiver of the reply, the receiver being the sender or a receiver in communication with a second communication network (pg 9, lines 5-8); and

(d) a user interface in communication with the information delivery server, the user interface having

Art Unit: 2154

a terminal connected to the information delivery system for creating and maintaining a service in the information delivery system (pg 8, lines 13-15).

10. Gardner does not teach:

(a) information receiving modules for receiving messages from a sender in communication with a first communication network and for converting the messages into a form suited for an information processing unit in communication with the information receiving modules.

11. Saito teaches:

(a) information receiving modules for receiving messages from a sender in communication with a first communication network and for converting the messages into a form suited for an information processing unit in communication with the information receiving modules (Col. 4, lines 26-28; Col. 5, lines 14-31).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Gardner and Saito because they both dealing with data conversion utilizing a remote service. Furthermore, the teaching of Saito to allow information receiving modules for receiving messages from a sender in communication with a first communication network and for converting the messages into a form suited for an information processing unit in communication with the information receiving modules would improve the efficiency for Gardner's system by categorizing the information need to be fetched via a conversion process, thus instead of manually entering the data, the system is able to automatically parse and categorize the data that need to be fetched.

13. As per claim 25, Gardner teaches the information delivery system according to claim 24 wherein the information sending modules are in communication with an information control module for receiving an answer therefrom for sending the replies via a sending module to the receiver of the reply (pg 9, lines

5-8).

14. As per claim 26, Gardner teaches the information delivery system according to claim 24 wherein the information processing unit is in communication with a plurality of networks and is adapted to fetch information requested in the messages, from the plurality of networks or data bases stored in the information delivery server (pg 3, lines 1-2, lines 5-6, lines 8-9).

15. As per claim 27, Gardner teaches the information delivery system according to claim 24 wherein the information processing unit is adapted to handle the messages and the information requested by means of a service product that has a command list program comprising a list of functions (pg 9, lines 5-7).

16. As per claim 28, Gardner teaches the information delivery system according to claim 27 wherein the command list program is stored in a database of the information delivery server (pg 9, lines 5-8, lines 11-14).

17. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al. (hereinafter Gardner), EP 0890913 in view of Saito et al. (hereinafter Saito) EP 0923034, in further view of “Official Notice”.

18. As per claim 29, Gardner and Saito does not teach the information delivery system according to claim 24 wherein the first communication network is a wireless communication network. However ‘Official Notice’ is taken by the Examiner that a wireless communications network is notoriously well known. It would have been obvious to have used a wireless communications network for the current invention, because doing so would be less of a burden to set up landline infrastructure for newly developed areas, through wireless network, one can reach vast distances without laying out massive ground infrastructure, thereby improving efficiency and cost.

Art Unit: 2154

19. Claims 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al. (hereinafter Gardner), EP 0890913 in view of Saito et al. (hereinafter Saito) EP 0923034.

20. As per claim 30, Gardner teaches the invention substantially as claimed wherein a method of delivering information to communication networks, comprising:

- (c) processing the messages based on key data of the messages (pg 8, lines 47-49);
- (d) fetching information requested in the messages (pg 8, lines 13-15, lines 47-49);
- (e) processing the fetched information (pg 9, lines 5-8);
- (f) preparing replies based on the fetched information (pg 9, lines 5-8, lines 23-25);
- (g) converting the replies to a first form suited for the first communication network if the replies are sent to the first communication network and converting the replies to a second form suited for the second communication network if the replies are sent to the second communication network; and
- (h) sending the replies to the first communication network or a second network (pg 9, lines 5-8, lines 51-58).

21. Gardner does not teach:

- (a) receiving messages from a first communication network;
- (b) converting the messages to a form for further processing;

22. Saito teaches

- (a) receiving messages from a first communication network (Col. 4, lines 26-28);
- (b) converting the messages to a form for further processing (Col. 5, lines 14-31).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Gardner and Saito because they both dealing with data conversion utilizing a remote service. Furthermore, the teaching of Saito to allow receiving messages from a first

communication network and converting the messages to a form for further processing would improve the efficiency for Gardner's system by categorizing the information need to be fetched via a conversion process, thus instead of manually entering the data, the system is able to automatically parse and categorize the data that need to be fetched.

24. As per claim 31, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises fetching information requested in the messages from a plurality of networks or from a database stored in the information delivery server (pg 9, lines 5-8).

25. As per claim 32, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 31 wherein the method further comprising processing the messages and fetching the information requested by means of a service product, including simple functions in a command list program, created in the information delivery system (pg 3, lines 1-2; pg 8, lines 26-31, lines 47-49; pg 9, lines 5-7, lines 51-58).

26. As per claim 33, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises storing an information delivery product, comprising the information requested, in a database (pg 3, lines 5-6; pg 9, lines 5-8).

27. As per claim 34, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 33 wherein the method further comprises modifying the information delivery product with parameters added to fields of an information delivery product program (pg 8, lines 16-31).

28. As per claim 35, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 33 wherein the method further comprises describing a function of the information delivery product with a binary program module and transferring the binary program module to an information delivery system (pg 9, lines 5-17).

29. As per claim 36, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein method further

comprises describing a function of an information delivery product with a program stored in the first communication network (pg 9, lines 5-17).

30. As per claim 37, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises storing data from a set of information delivery products in an information delivery server (pg 5, lines 44-45, lines 50-53).

31. As per claim 38, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises storing data about a user, the data excluding identification data of the user (pg 6, lines 48-54; pg 5, lines 4-5).

32. As per claim 39, Gardner teaches the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises constructing an information delivery product to conform to an mediated information and to prevent access to predetermined data in the communication network (pg 7, lines 43-49).

33. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al. (hereinafter Gardner), EP 0890913 in view of Saito et al. (hereinafter Saito) EP 0923034, in further view of "Official Notice".

34. As per claim 40, Gardner and Saito does not teach the method according to claim 30 wherein the method further comprises delaying the replies prior to sending the replies. However 'Official Notice' is taken by the Examiner that a delay the reply prior to sending the reply is notoriously well known. It would have been obvious to have used a delay of a reply for the current invention, because doing so would be less burdening on the communications circuits, through a delay the system as a result would have less traffic thus improving the efficiency. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to have used a delay of reply to give the system of present invention additional time to perform verification upon the

potential intruder.

***Conclusion***

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Information Delivery System, Method For Information Delivery, Service Product And Use Of Service Product".

- i. US 6092114 Shaffer et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ  
March 9, 2004

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100